

## ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** World Journal of Neurology

**ESPS manuscript NO:** 15133

**Title:** Rituximab in neuromyelitis optica: A review of literature

**Reviewer's code:** 00685143

**Reviewer's country:** United States

**Science editor:** Fang-Fang Ji

**Date sent for review:** 2014-11-11 16:15

**Date reviewed:** 2014-12-17 05:58

| CLASSIFICATION   | LANGUAGE EVALUATION  | SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT                          | CONCLUSION   |
|--|--|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent            | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing     | PubMed Search:                                 | <input type="checkbox"/> Accept                        |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good | <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing           | <input type="checkbox"/> The same title        | <input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good                 | <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing | <input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication | <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection                     |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair                 | <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected                           | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision     |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor                 |  | [Y] No   | <input type="checkbox"/> Major revision                |
|  |  | BPG Search:                                    |  |
|  |  | <input type="checkbox"/> The same title        |  |
|  |  | <input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication |  |
|  |  | <input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism            |  |
|  |  | [Y] No   |  |

## COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

This is well-written and topical. I suggest revising it to include the total # of articles originally included and how many were excluded due to each criteria. The discussion should include any effect those exclusions had on your conclusions. Also please comment on the expected PML rate with RTX based on all data as well as possible pitfalls of using RTX with immunosuppressants.

## ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** World Journal of Neurology

**ESPS manuscript NO:** 15133

**Title:** Rituximab in neuromyelitis optica: A review of literature

**Reviewer's code:** 02909071

**Reviewer's country:** China

**Science editor:** Fang-Fang Ji

**Date sent for review:** 2014-11-11 16:15

**Date reviewed:** 2014-11-25 12:16

| CLASSIFICATION                              | LANGUAGE EVALUATION  | SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT                          | CONCLUSION   |
|---|--|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent | <input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing                | PubMed Search:                                 | <input type="checkbox"/> Accept                        |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good | <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing           | <input type="checkbox"/> The same title        | <input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good      | <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing | <input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication | <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection                     |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair      | <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected                           | <input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism            | <input type="checkbox"/> Minor revision                |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor      |  | <input type="checkbox"/> No                    | <input type="checkbox"/> Major revision                |
|   |  | BPG Search:                                    |  |
|   |  | <input type="checkbox"/> The same title        |  |
|   |  | <input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication |  |
|   |  | <input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism            |  |
|   |  | <input type="checkbox"/> No                    |  |

## COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

The authors address a well organized review for rituximab treatment on NMO including the rationale, efficacy, adverse events, dosage, variability and then conclude and point some questions for future studies. This is a clinically concerned topic. However, authors should pay more attention on details that require revisions and editing.

## ESPS PEER-REVIEW REPORT

**Name of journal:** World Journal of Neurology

**ESPS manuscript NO:** 15133

**Title:** Rituximab in neuromyelitis optica: A review of literature

**Reviewer's code:** 02458824

**Reviewer's country:** Spain

**Science editor:** Fang-Fang Ji

**Date sent for review:** 2014-11-11 16:15

**Date reviewed:** 2014-12-17 18:22

| CLASSIFICATION                                    | LANGUAGE EVALUATION   | SCIENTIFIC MISCONDUCT                          | CONCLUSION   |
|---|---|--|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Excellent       | <input type="checkbox"/> Grade A: Priority publishing                 | PubMed Search:                                 | <input type="checkbox"/> Accept                        |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Very good       | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade B: Minor language polishing | <input type="checkbox"/> The same title        | <input type="checkbox"/> High priority for publication |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Grade C: Good | <input type="checkbox"/> Grade C: A great deal of language polishing  | <input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication | <input type="checkbox"/> Rejection                     |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Fair            | <input type="checkbox"/> Grade D: Rejected                            | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Minor revision     |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Grade E: Poor            |   | [Y] No   | <input type="checkbox"/> Major revision                |
|   |   | BPG Search:                                    |  |
|   |   | <input type="checkbox"/> The same title        |  |
|   |   | <input type="checkbox"/> Duplicate publication |  |
|   |   | <input type="checkbox"/> Plagiarism            |  |
|   |   | [Y] No   |  |

## COMMENTS TO AUTHORS

Major comment: Authors should include a comment on page 12, after the first paragraph, about the use of plasma exchange (PE) in treating neuromyelitis optica (NMO). Based on the involvement of NMO-IgG in the pathogenesis of NMO, it is reasonable to postulate that PE has a role in the treatment of NMO (J Clin Apher 2013;28:145-284). In fact, PE in conjunction with rituximab is used in other immune-mediated diseases (Autoimmunity Rev 211;10:679-84; Transfus Apher Sci 2014;51:209-14). Minor comments: 1. Page 5, line 7: "...compliment..."??? 2. Page 5, line 12: "...humeral..."??? 3. Page 6, line 3: this reviewer is not familiar with ARR. Could authors explain what AAR mean? 4. Page 8, line 13: "Several studies..." I think authors should report the exact number of studies reviewed. 5. Page 8, line 22: "They correlated... CD19+ cells correlated"???? 6. Page 9, first paragraph: Authors should consider to add a comment about the use of lower doses of rituximab, because the doses reported in reviewed papers come from doses used for treating patients with lymphoma. For patients with immune-mediated diseases, lower doses of rituximab have been reported as succesful. 7. Page 10, line 9: "patent..."??? 8. Page 11, first line: How many studies across the world have documented improvement...in a how many NMO patients? 9. Page 11, line 9: "...in all



## BAISHIDENG PUBLISHING GROUP INC

8226 Regency Drive, Pleasanton, CA 94588, USA

Telephone: +1-925-223-8242

Fax: +1-925-223-8243

E-mail: [bpgoffice@wjgnet.com](mailto:bpgoffice@wjgnet.com)

<http://www.wjgnet.com>

---

but a small..."??? 10. Table 1. Authors should consider to add the reference number of the studies on the table. Authors should consider to report the column 8 (ARR relapses) in two columns (before and after).